

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2008-09**Brooklyn School District**

LOUISE S. BERRY, Superintendent
Telephone: (860) 774-9153

Location: 119 Gorman Road
Brooklyn,
Connecticut

Website: www.brooklynschools.org

This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c) using data and narratives provided by the school district, testing services, or the US Census. Profiles and additional education data, including longitudinal data, are available on the internet at www.sde.ct.gov.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: Windham	Per Capita Income in 2000: \$20,359
Town Population in 2000: 7,173	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 21.0%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 7.4%	Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 0.7%
Number of Public Schools: 2	District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 94.4%

*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

District Reference Group (DRG): E DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment. The Connecticut State Board of Education approved DRG classification for purposes of reporting data other than student performance.

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Enrollment on October 1, 2008 981
5-Year Enrollment Change 0.3%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range PK- 8

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	199	20.3	11.1	30.3
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	0	0.0	0.6	5.2
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	26	2.7	3.8	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	108	11.0	11.1	11.4
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	77	96.3	85.5	79.7
Homeless	0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*84.6% of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	5	0.5
Asian American	16	1.6
Black	16	1.6
Hispanic	19	1.9
White	925	94.3
Total Minority	56	5.7

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 1.2%

Non-English Home Language: 1.3% of this district's students (excluding prekindergarten students) come from homes where English is not the primary language. The number of non-English home languages is 7.

EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

Below is the description submitted by this school of how it provides educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

Brooklyn is a small town with very little racial diversity. However, its economic diversity is evidenced by the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price meals. Hence, the issue of economic isolation and fragmented families is an ongoing concern to members of our staff. At the elementary level, we work to address the limitations in the lives of many of our students through a variety of curricular projects to provide opportunities for students to experience other cultures and field trips to enrich and broaden their perspective.

At the middle school level, the many cultural enrichment activities throughout the year in language arts, social studies and science help to broaden students' understanding of the differences and the similarities of different ethnic groups and also help to develop an appreciation of the traditions of other cultures. The faculty has incorporated diversity into their instructional activities and our field trip programs provides opportunities for students to interact with students from other schools. Our technological resources and extensive use of the Internet have helped our students to bring the world a little closer. Each and every classroom is equipped with computers that have Internet capability.

Our secondary students are tuitioned to a number of high schools in eastern Connecticut under the Board's Freedom of Choice policy and thus have access to a broad range of programs/activities and become members of student bodies with much more diversity than is possible in Brooklyn. Within the scope of their experience in our designated high schools, our secondary students have the opportunity to learn about, interact with and respect members of different ethnic, racial and economic backgrounds and cultures.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % Meeting State Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	55.7	54.6	35.2
Writing	60.2	62.5	32.7
Mathematics	59.1	62.8	27.7
Grade 4 Reading	61.4	60.7	35.6
Writing	63.5	64.2	33.3
Mathematics	67.3	63.6	43.3
Grade 5 Reading	55.1	66.0	16.8
Writing	64.4	66.5	31.5
Mathematics	56.1	68.8	13.0
Science	46.5	58.1	14.8
Grade 6 Reading	75.3	68.9	44.2
Writing	60.2	62.2	33.1
Mathematics	76.4	68.8	49.1
Grade 7 Reading	74.4	74.9	34.4
Writing	60.4	62.9	32.5
Mathematics	67.8	66.0	40.8
Grade 8 Reading	65.8	68.4	28.4
Writing	63.6	66.5	27.7
Mathematics	59.6	64.5	26.5
Science	66.9	60.6	38.1

These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal. The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. The following results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the school at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the school. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A
Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A

For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Physical Fitness. The assessment includes tests for flexibility, abdominal strength and endurance, upper-body strength and aerobic endurance.

Physical Fitness: % of Students Reaching Health Standard on All Four Tests	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	38.2	36.2	52.1

SAT [®] I: Reasoning Test Class of 2008		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		N/A	N/A	
Average Score	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Critical Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A

SAT[®] I. The lowest possible score on each SAT[®] I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Class of 2008	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cumulative Four-Year Dropout Rate for Class of 2008	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	N/A	N/A	N/A

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	N/A	N/A
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	N/A	N/A

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of District Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	61.41
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	14.68
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	5.00
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	18.00
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	2.07
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	0.00
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	1.00
School Level	4.02
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	1.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	4.00
School Nurses	2.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	43.90

In the full-time equivalent (FTE) count, staff members working part-time in the school district are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in the district contributes 0.50 to the district's staff count.

Teachers and Instructors	District	DRG	State
Average Years of Experience in Education	18.5	14.6	13.6
% with Master's Degree or Above	82.4	77.2	76.1

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	13.3	15.8	18.3
Grade 2	20.8	17.5	19.3
Grade 5	19.4	19.6	21.0
Grade 7	18.6	19.5	20.5
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	978	993	988
Middle School	991	1,010	1,016
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*State law requires that at least 900 hours of instruction be offered to students in grade 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours to half-day kindergarten students.

Students Per Academic Computer	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School*	8.3	2.7	3.3
Middle School	3.2	2.1	2.6
High School	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2007-08

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. DRG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

Expenditures All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	Elementary Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$6,292	\$6,381	\$7,411	\$7,032	\$7,522
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$115	\$117	\$332	\$303	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$216	\$219	\$232	\$409	\$446
Student Support Services	\$839	\$851	\$796	\$862	\$806
Administration and Support Services	\$930	\$943	\$1,508	\$1,365	\$1,369
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$818	\$829	\$1,249	\$1,339	\$1,377
Transportation	\$1,129	\$779	\$610	\$671	\$644
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out*	\$672	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$21	\$21	\$87	\$158	\$151
Total*	\$11,032	\$10,933	\$12,897	\$12,486	\$12,805
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$4,343	\$4,404	\$1,185	\$1,677	\$1,759

*Town total expenditures (in 1000s) for PK-12 are: Total, \$15,326; Tuition Costs, \$4,966.

Total town expenditures per pupil for PK-12 are \$11,106.

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$2,634,839	17.2	19.0	20.5

Revenue Sources, % of Expenditures from Source. Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

District Expenditures	Local Revenue	State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other
Including School Construction	40.6	57.2	2.2	0.0
Excluding School Construction	49.2	48.0	2.9	0.0

EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

The Board of Education's policy on the allocation of district resources provides the framework for both expenditures and revenues and translates into financial terms the priorities and education needs of the district. The Board expects the superintendent to work closely with building level administrators in studying the needs of the school and recommendations are consistent with those needs. Building administrators are expected to confer with their grade level teams to obtain information on needs and priorities.

The Board formulates the annual budget through a committee structure and solicits comments and recommendations from parents and community members. Resources are allocated in an equitable manner in an attempt to meet the needs of all students. Limited budget dollars are targeted toward priorities which are established by the Board of Education and the administration. Programmatic issues such as staff/student ratios and class size are reviewed annually or more frequently if necessary.

With the economic pressure on our budget process this year, our goal for the development of the 2009-2010 budget was to maintain current programs and services. However, as a result of the economy, we had to cut staff, both certified and non-certified, as well as supplies and equipment.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	130
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	10.4%

Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities				
Disability	Count	District Percent	DRG Percent	State Percent
Autism	4	0.3	0.8	0.8
Learning Disability	54	4.3	3.7	3.9
Intellectual Disability	3	0.2	0.4	0.5
Emotional Disturbance	14	1.1	0.7	1.0
Speech Impairment	33	2.6	2.9	2.3
Other Health Impairment*	15	1.2	1.8	2.1
Other Disabilities**	7	0.6	0.7	0.9
Total	130	10.4	11.1	11.6

*Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

**Includes hearing, visual, and orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and developmental delay

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2007-08 with a Standard Diploma	N/A	81.4
2007-08 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	N/A	3.5

STATE ASSESSMENTS

Percent of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. These results are for students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

- **Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), Fourth Generation.** The CMT reading, writing and mathematics tests are administered to students in Grades 3 through 8, and the CMT science test to students in Grades 5 and 8.
- **Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), Third Generation.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students.

State Assessment		Students with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	9.7	30.2	64.5	65.7
	Writing	9.1	19.5	62.2	64.1
	Mathematics	21.3	30.7	64.1	65.7
	Science	6.7	23.8	57.5	59.4
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Writing Across the Disciplines	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on “No Child Left Behind.”

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools		
CMT	% Without Accommodations	0.0
	% With Accommodations	100.0
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	N/A
	% With Accommodations	N/A
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		2.4

Accommodations for a student’s disability may be made to allow him or her to participate in testing. Students whose disabilities prevent them from taking the test even with accommodations are assessed by means of a list of skills aligned to the same content and grade level standards as the CMT and CAPT.

Federal law requires that students with disabilities be educated with their non-disabled peers as much as is appropriate. Placement in separate educational facilities tends to reduce the chances of students with disabilities interacting with non-disabled peers, and of receiving the same education.

K-12 Students with Disabilities Placed in Educational Settings Other Than This District’s Schools		
Placement	Count	Percent
Public Schools in Other Districts	0	0.0
Private Schools or Other Settings	12	9.2

Number and Percentage of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible by the Percentage of Time They Spent with Their Non-Disabled Peers				
Time Spent with Non-Disabled Peers	Count of Students	Percent of Students		
		District	DRG	State
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	104	80.0	75.5	72.7
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	16	12.3	18.1	16.1
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	10	7.7	6.4	11.2

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

As a result of our scores on the 2009 CMTs, we began the 2009-2010 school year with a school-wide goal to increase the academic achievement of all students, specifically in reading. We trained staff members in the use of data to analyze student progress, we asked team/grade level staff members to use their planning meetings to review student performance and plan appropriate instructional activities and we asked our remedial reading teachers to spend time in the regular classrooms modeling instructional practices. Finally, we increased the time for collaboration between our remedial/developmental reading teacher at the elementary level, and we re-hired a developmental reading teacher with federal stimulus funds to address this issue.

Our reading coordinator will work with all classroom teachers in grades K through four to introduce both a new reading series and the use of the DIBELS Program to collect the data on reading performance which will allow us to both assess progress frequently and to modify instruction practices as needed. The monitoring of student progress with particular attention to phonological awareness and alphabetic principles in the early grades will help teachers provide appropriate targeted instruction.

In the areas of special education, our focus has been on inclusion of all special needs students in the regular classroom program thus increasing the time with non-disabled peers. This has been accomplished by an increase in the use of trained paraprofessionals working with individuals or small groups of students in the regular classroom under the supervision of the classroom teacher and the special education instructor.

Our efforts to involve parents and community members in the review of school programs and the planning and/or improvement of school programs was the goal of our Children First Program. This program, previously known as the Brooklyn Collaborative for Young Children held a number of community conversations on educational issues during the 2008-2009 school year which were funded by the Graustein Foundation. These conversations provided an opportunity for parents and community members of varying backgrounds to discuss local education needs and programs for their children and their community. These conversations will continue during the 2009-2010 school year.

In the fall of 2008, Brooklyn opened a new building for its Early Childhood Center. This building of 18,000 square feet provides space for an enrollment of 250 Pre-K and K students. With its developmental based curriculum supported by early assessment and intervention for each student, Brooklyn has committed its resources to a program of comprehensive early learning in order to give every child in this community an opportunity to be successful in later educational programs.
